

We sit around thumbing our suspenders and smoking cigars and pontificating about free trade, never willing to say to the Koreans: If you want to trade with us, I will tell you what, then be fair. If our market is open to you, your market must be open to us. If not, sell your cars in Zambia. Go try to sell them there. You don't sell them in the American marketplace unless your market is open to our product.

How about China? It is interesting. We did a bilateral trade agreement with China. I would love to find the negotiator who made that deal for us.

Here is what our negotiator agreed to. After a phase-in, the Chinese will impose a 25-percent tariff on American cars that would be sold in China. And we will only have a 2.5-percent tariff on Chinese cars they want to sell in the United States. The Chinese can have a tariff 10 times the size of ours on reciprocal automobile trade.

I think that is stark raving nuts. Who on Earth could have negotiated such an incompetent deal? Do we not have people who will stand up for the interests of this country for a change?

Here is what I suggest for that trade negotiator. That trade negotiator should have worn this shirt during the negotiations.

You know we just finished the Olympics. We asked the Olympic athletes to wear a uniform so we could look down and see where they are from, and it always says USA. God bless them. I would love our trade negotiator, just once, to wear a uniform that says USA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. I would love, just once, to ask our trade negotiators to wear a uniform so at least they know on whose behalf they are negotiating.

I am so tired of what is happening in international trade negotiations. Will Rogers said, 70 years ago, that the United States of America has never lost a war and never won a conference. He must surely have been thinking about our trade negotiators. It doesn't matter what it is—the United States-Canada FTA, CAFTA, NAFTA, WTO—all our negotiators have to do is show up and lose. They do it routinely.

This isn't a partisan issue, international trade. I think both Republicans and Democrats have let this country down. We need a new trade strategy.

Globalization is here, that is true. We are not going to turn back globalization, but we at least, by God, ought to have rules that are fair to this country and to the workers of this country and to the businesses of this country that do business here and stay here.

I have one final point. This Senate did not even have the strength and the backbone to at least shut down the per-

verse tax incentives that reward companies that export U.S. jobs. If we cannot take the first baby step in the right direction, it is a pretty hopeless situation.

We will have an opportunity to address these issues next year. I hope Republicans and Democrats today will decide in unison that exporting these jobs hurts this country, and there are policies and approaches we can do to change the fortune of this country's economic future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for so much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about the war in Iraq and what I consider to be a larger problem confronting this Nation, indeed, confronting the American people, particularly during an election year. It is really a challenge we all have, and that is how, in a country that is founded on the legitimacy of our laws, being founded on consent of the governed, how do the people know what is happening, not just in their Government but in the world? How do they get good information?

I will give an example. Two nights ago, I received a call from one of my constituents in Lubbock, TX, who said he had heard we were going to reinstate the draft because of concerns about Iraq and Afghanistan and American forces being spread too thin. Of course, I told him we have more than 2.5 million men and women in uniform, including our Active Duty, our Reserves, and our National Guard. I said the phrase I have come to use often, and that is that we are out of balance, but we are not out of troops.

Secretary Rumsfeld yesterday spoke before the Armed Services Committee—the distinguished Presiding Officer, of course, is a member of that committee and heard those remarks as well—that we are in the process of restructuring our military forces so we can access more of those forces, so we can put those troops where they need to be. That is a process that is part of the global posture review and certainly the Base Realignment and Closure Commission process that goes forward next year, all of which falls under the heading of transformation.

Getting back to the question my constituent asked—which is, I am worried because I hear that we may reinstate the draft—I asked Secretary Rumsfeld that very question. Indeed, I alluded to a statement that had been made the day before by the Democratic Presidential nominee where it was said that it was possible that the President would reinstate the draft to handle the

war in Iraq if President Bush was re-elected. This statement followed on a charge last week that the President was planning a surprise postelection callup of additional Guard and Reserve troops.

I asked the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Rumsfeld, for the record: Are there any plans for a postelection callup of additional Guard and Reserve troops, and is there any truth to this rumor that the President plans to reinstate the draft?

He gave a very spirited response, but the bottom line is he said: That is nonsense. It is not true. It is false.

I guess if he could find other ways to try to get that message through, he would do that. I cannot remember if it was Mark Twain who said rumor makes it halfway around the world while the truth is still putting on its shoes, or something to that effect. It is in that vein that I come to the floor of the Senate to talk about Iraq.

Let me start by sharing the results of a recent nationwide poll of the Iraqi people conducted by the Independent Institute for Administrative and Civil Society Studies. I refer to this poll because, of course, like the distinguished Presiding Officer, I am sure she has experienced troops who have been in Iraq and come back to the United States, who read the newspaper accounts, watch TV news, and do not recognize what they are seeing and reading because, indeed, the troops in Iraq, in addition to being everyday heroes, are well disciplined, morale is high, and they know they are doing an important job and they are getting the job done. But they come back to the States, read a newspaper and watch the news, and they are met with gloom and doom and pessimism about our prospects.

I worry—and I expressed this concern yesterday—that particularly in an election season, those of us who are in elected office need to be very careful and very responsible about our statements, even when we are in the heat of political combat, because we do not want to do anything that would have the consequence of demoralizing our troops or breaking the resolve of the American people as we fight this global war on terror.

But this poll of the Iraqi people I believe is important because it consisted of more than 2,300 household interviews and was distributed across Iraq's 18 provinces. Here are just a few of the interesting statistics this survey reveals:

A full 75 percent of the Iraqis expressed hopefulness about the future of the nation, and more than 70 percent say they would not leave their country even if they were given an opportunity to live elsewhere.

While earlier polls show the Iraqis were concerned with security, and that is obvious to all of us that they would be and should be, as we are, the Iraqi police and army are gaining the confidence of the Iraqi people to deal with their transition from a terrible, blood-thirsty dictator under Saddam Hussein

to now this interim government leading up to full democratic elections in late January. More than two-thirds of the respondents expressed trust for the Iraqi men and women trying to bring about peace and stability and security—that is, the growing Iraqi Army and security forces—and, in fact, as the distinguished Presiding Officer knows, the single largest component of the coalition efforts in Iraq now are Iraqis. More than 238,000 Iraqis serve as part of that country's security force as we speak. As we have heard from Secretary Rumsfeld and others, that will continue to grow.

General David Petraeus is assigned the job of making sure they are trained. As we train more recruits to become good security forces in Iraq, it will decrease the pressure on America to provide those security forces and others of our coalition partners. That is good news to me and I am sure good news to people all across this country.

This same survey revealed that the interim government of Iraq is trusted by 65 percent of its citizens.

I wish all of us in elected office could claim those sorts of approval ratings in the United States, but I will not go there. The Iraqi courts and judges, the most important component of restoring respect for the rule of law in Iraq, are trusted by more than 64 percent of Iraqis responding to this survey of 2,300 households. More than 77 percent of those polled believe that holding regular, fair elections is the most important political right for the Iraqi people.

I will talk more to that in a moment, because I am afraid there are some who do not believe that the people of the Middle East are capable of democracy and doubt their aspirations for liberty. But 77 percent of those polled believe that holding regular, fair elections is the most important political right for the Iraqi people.

Finally, 58 percent of those polled believe that democracy in Iraq is likely to succeed. That is a far cry from the doom and gloom preached by some of the naysayers in this election season and, indeed, some of what we see on our televisions and read in our newspapers.

Yesterday, in a joint session of Congress, I had the honor to hear interim Prime Minister Allawi speak. He started out his remarks, after a few moments, with these words: Thank you, America. Thank you, America, for delivering the Iraqi people from a terrible dictator and tyrant in Saddam Hussein.

He went on to express his appreciation not only for the sacrifices of the men and women in uniform but to all of the people of this great country who hold the ideal of liberty, freedom, and opportunity as not just an American aspiration but something that everyone, every human being, aspires to.

I will quote from his remarks because they go to the heart of the pessimism that is expressed in some quarters about the Middle East and what is happening in Iraq. He said:

Ladies and gentlemen, good will aside, I know that many observers around the world honestly wonder if we in Iraq really can restore our economy, be good neighbors, guarantee the democratic rule of law and overcome the enemies who seek to tear us down. I understand why, faced with the daily headlines, there are these doubts. I know, too, that there will be many more setbacks and obstacles to overcome.

But these doubters risk underestimating our country and they risk fueling the hopes of the terrorists.

I will read that again because it is so important. Prime Minister Allawi said:

But these doubters risk underestimating our country and they risk fueling the hopes of the terrorists.

He goes on to say:

Despite our problems, despite our recent history, no one should doubt that Iraq is a country of tremendous human resources and national resources.

Iraq is still a nation with an inspiring culture and tradition and an educated and civilized people. And Iraq is still a land made strong by a faith which teaches us tolerance, love, respect and duty.

Above all, they risk underestimating the courage, determination of the Iraqi people to embrace democracy, peace and freedom, for the dreams of our families are the same as the dreams of the families here in America and around the world. There are those who want to divide our world. I appeal to you, who have done so much already to help us, to ensure they don't succeed.

Do not allow them to say to Iraqis, to Arabs, to Muslims, that we have only two models of governments, brutal dictatorship and religious extremism. This is wrong.

Like Americans, we Iraqis want to enjoy the fruits of liberty. Half of the world's 1.5 billion Muslims already enjoy democratically elected governments.

As Prime Minister Blair said to you last year when he stood here, anywhere, any time ordinary people are given the chance to choose, the choice is the same: freedom over tyranny, democracy not dictatorship, and the rule of law not the rule of the secret police.

Do not allow them to convince others that the values of freedom, of tolerance and democracy are for you in the West but not for us.

For the first time in our history, the Iraqi people can look forward to controlling our own destiny. This would not have been possible without the help and sacrifices of this country and its coalition partners. I thank you again from the bottom of my heart.

Finally, the Prime Minister said:

And let me tell you that as we meet our greatest challenge by building a democratic future, we the people of the new Iraq will remember those who have stood by us. As generous as you have been, we will stand with you, too. As stalwart as you have been, we will stand with you, too. Neither tyranny nor terrorism has a place in our region or our world. And that is why we Iraqis will stand by you, America, in a war larger than either of our nations, the global battle to live in freedom.

I believe that lengthy quote is worth hearing again because I also want to talk a minute about the nature of the threat we confront and that Prime Minister Allawi spoke of, not just a war confined to Iraq but indeed a global war on terrorism.

It was 3 years ago this month that we were forced to realize as a nation that

the terrorist foe we had been fighting on the margin for years sought a more deadly goal than we ever suspected. The terrorist threat we battle today does not just seek victory over America; it seeks an extermination of our unity, our culture, our liberty, everything that makes America the envy of the free world today.

I think of recent expressions I have read. The 9/11 Commission did a very good job of expressing the nature of the threat Prime Minister Allawi spoke of and that we confront today. Under its recommendations, the 9/11 Commission said:

The enemy is not just "terrorism." It is the threat posed specifically by Islamist terrorism, by Bin Ladin and others who draw on a long tradition of extreme intolerance within a minority strain of Islam that does not distinguish politics from religion, and distorts both.

The enemy is not Islam, the great world faith, but a perversion of Islam. The enemy goes beyond al Qaeda to include the radical ideological movement, inspired in part by al Qaeda, that has spawned other terrorist groups and violence. Thus our strategy must match our means to two ends: dismantling the al Qaeda network and, in the long term, prevailing over the ideology that contributes to Islamic terrorism.

Skipping down a paragraph, they conclude from this reading:

What should Americans expect from their government? The goal seems unlimited: Defeat terrorism anywhere in the world.

We have seen—and it is not a matter of taking my word for it or even the 9/11 Commission's word for it or Prime Minister Allawi's word for it—that the war we are fighting is not confined to Iraq. It is not confined to Afghanistan. In fact, I think those who suggest otherwise are ignoring the lessons of history, as well as the sage words of the 9/11 Commission, the Prime Minister, and others.

We have seen the evil works of this terrorist wave, and not just on 9/11. We saw the attack on the *USS Cole* in 2000, an attack that killed 17 American sailors and wounded 39. We saw the bombing in Bali in Indonesia 2 years ago. We see, it seems like with horrible regularity, Palestinian suicide attacks in Israel, and the United Nations compound car bomb attack in Iraq.

This year alone we have seen massacres in Madrid, the Twin Tupolev bombings in Russia, and the suicide car bomb attacks in Afghanistan and Iraq. Most recently, we have seen the butchery by terrorists who murdered children in the schoolyards of Beslan.

No, the war on terror is not limited to Iraq. It is not limited to Afghanistan. They are but fronts in the global war we are waging today. In fact, it was the combatant commander, the Central Command General John Abizaid, who only a couple of months ago admonished all of us in the Senate not to look at the war as though looking through a soda straw, not to look at what is happening in Afghanistan and at what is happening in Iraq and say this is all there is, this is reality.

Indeed, some have even suggested that the war in Iraq is a diversion from the real war on terror. But, of course, that is flying in the face of the facts: the long litany of terrorist attacks in many different parts of the world, the presence of Al Qaeda forces and allies in Iraq, and, of course, what Prime Minister Allawi has said as well.

Indeed, during this political season when international affairs and the war on terror is a prime topic in political debates and discussions, there appears to be an attempt to decouple Iraq from the global war on terrorism, to suggest that it is a distraction. But I hope I have convinced those within the sound of my voice that cannot be true; that is not true. Indeed, I believe that argument is a disservice to the American people and our forces in the field, whose resolve must remain strong as we continue to fight this great scourge on humanity.

Under President Bush's leadership, despite the naysayers who claim this task could not be done, we have confronted this evil for what it is. We have employed the very best weapon America has to offer: the power of our ideals and the power of liberty. Even as we battle them around the world, the terrorists have flocked to specific points to battle us. As coalition forces liberated Iraq and Afghanistan, they have been attracted to Iraq and Afghanistan like moths to the flame. Why? Because they realize that their dark ideology of hate will not—cannot—survive the spreading light of freedom.

The spread of democracy, the new foundation of the rule of law, and the creation of fledgling representative governments that honor and respect human rights—together these actions spell out the increasing marginalization of the terrorists, as they have fewer and fewer places to run and hide. Ultimately, they herald the end of terrorism as we know it.

Of course, none of us asked for this task. We cannot erase 9/11, as much as our hearts desire it. We cannot change the past. But we must acknowledge that this responsibility has fallen to us—in this time, in this generation—and we must and we will win by fighting this enemy where they plot and plan, so we do not have to fight them on American soil.

I want to reiterate: We must always remain conscious in this body as elected officials, as representatives of our States and of this great Nation—we must always be conscious of the fact that the words we say, particularly during an election season, can have a broad and negative effect on the morale of our soldiers in the field. We must continue to give our forces all the support they need and stay focused on our goal. And while our enemies began this fight on their terms, we will finish it on ours.

We will widen the span of the democratic peace into places where the enemy trains and recruits. We will liberate the people held under the yoke of

darkness and despotism for generations. And around the world we will hear the rumble of millions of people waking to discover that yes, at long last, they are free.

Madam President, the terrorists have heard a great noise in Iraq—and it is the sound of their doom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

SECRET HOLDS

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I think if you walked down the streets of the small towns in North Carolina or Oregon and asked people what the "secret hold" is in the Senate, my guess is you would not find one out of a thousand people who would have any idea what this extraordinarily important rule is here in the Senate. As the President knows, it is possible for any Member of this body to put a hold on a bill or nomination, and do it in secret. It is one of the most extraordinary powers a Member of the Senate has.

Senator GRASSLEY and I have led, over more than 5 years, a bipartisan effort to try to change it, to have some sunlight over the secret hold. We have been fortunate to have the support of Senator LOTT and Senator DODD. Senator BYRD has been exceptionally helpful on it. I am very hopeful that we will finally get this changed when the Senate resumes in January, after the election.

Senator FRIST has been very kind meeting with us. He, of course, became the leader and had a lot on his plate besides the question of reform of Senate rules. But we saw again last week why this is so important. Right in front of the desks here in the front of our Chamber, we saw Senators scurrying around, trying to figure out who had a hold on their bill; who, in effect, was using in these last few days of our proceeding with our work before the election, who was holding up legislation they had worked on for months, and in a couple of cases, for years.

I think this is fundamentally wrong. The rules of this body and the precedents established, as Senator BYRD has taught us so well, make so much sense. But this is a flagrant example of abuse of the rules, to have in the last few days of a Senate session Senators scurrying about here in the front of the Chamber, trying to figure out who is objecting to something they have worked on.

I think we all ought to be held accountable. If you object to a nomination or a piece of legislation, fine. But with that right should come accountability. I am very hopeful we can get those rules changed. And in the spirit of changing those rules, Senator GRASSLEY and I have said we are in effect going to jump-start the process by making it clear that if we have an objection to the consideration of a nomination or a bill, we are going to come to the floor and announce it.

For that reason, I want to take a few minutes and outline why I publicly have placed a hold on the nomination of Deborah Majoras to chair the Federal Trade Commission. She now serves in a recess capacity. Of course, the FTC is the agency that is in a very strong position to protect the American consumer from price gouging at the gas pumps. But instead of doing its job, the Federal Trade Commission, in my view, has chosen to waste the taxpayers' money by very recently issuing a self-serving report that they use to justify their lack of enforcement action to block oil companies from merging.

In making these comments, I want to make it clear that there are a host of reasons why gasoline prices are going up. Worldwide demand is certainly a big factor. We see that higher demand is contributing to higher prices, particularly in the case of China. Certainly the mischief of OPEC is a very significant factor. Certainly the inability to put in place the kind of conservation practices our country needs in the transportation sector. There are a host of reasons why gasoline prices have soared. But the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), our independent body that audits these kinds of issues, said in an important recent study that the oil industry mergers the Federal Trade Commission keeps approving are a significant factor in why gasoline prices are so high.

In fact, the GAO found that the oil industry mergers that went through in the 1990s increased concentration in the oil industry significantly and increased gasoline prices for consumers by as much as 7 cents per gallon on the west coast of the United States.

Let us acknowledge there are a variety of reasons that gasoline prices have soared. But the GAO has found in an independent review that the policies of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to mergers have hammered the consumer, especially on the west coast of the United States, and in effect caused a shift of dollars out of the pockets of the consumer and into the pockets of those oil companies that benefit from these mergers.

In effect, the Federal Trade Commission again and again has tried to offer excuses for their inaction on this oil company merger issue. In their recent report, the Federal Trade Commission tries to excuse their inaction by claiming that gasoline prices at the pump are determined by world oil prices.

Again, no one disputes that can be a factor. But the record shows there is a lot more to this than the Federal Trade Commission's simplistic analysis.

Yesterday, for example, the price of a barrel of oil soared to \$49 per barrel, just short of the all-time highest price on record. Yesterday's price is 15 percent higher than the price of oil was just before the Memorial Day weekend.

In effect, there is a 25-percent difference in recent gasoline prices that cannot be explained by the Federal